



MODELS OF EVALUATION

Student of foreign language and literature: **Rakhimova Guli**
Urgench State Pedagogical Institute: Foreign language
Email: gulirakhimovaaa@gmail.com.
Mobile: +998918691334

Abstract:

This article explores the Kirkpatrick Assessment Model as a comprehensive framework for evaluating training programs and curricula. It outlines the model's four levels—Reaction, Learning, Behavior, and Results—and discusses how each phase contributes to understanding the effectiveness of training initiatives. The article emphasizes the importance of assessing not only immediate participant feedback but also long-term behavioral changes and organizational outcomes. Practical examples, such as teacher training in technology integration, are provided to illustrate each level. Although the model is sometimes criticized for being overly simplistic, it remains a valuable tool in both educational and professional settings for improving performance and achieving measurable results.

Key words: Kirkpatrick model , curriculum evaluation, training effectiveness, behavior, results.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqola Kirkpatrick baholash modelini o'quv dasturlari va treninglarni baholashda qo'llaniladigan keng qamrovli yondashuv sifatida ko'rib chiqadi. Modelning to'rtta bosqichi — Reaksiya, O'rganish, Xulq-atvor va Natijalar — har biri trening samaradorligini aniqlashda qanday rol o'ynashi tushuntirilgan. Muallif nafaqat ishtirokchilarning dastlabki fikrlarini, balki ularning ishdagi xulq-atvori va tashkilotga ta'sirini ham baholash muhimligini ta'kidlaydi. Har bir bosqich bo'yicha real misollar, jumladan, o'qituvchilarga texnologiyalarni o'rgatish kursi, keltirilgan. Model soddaligi uchun tanqid qilinsa-da, u hali ham ta'lim va ish jarayonlarida samaradorlikni oshirishda foydali vosita bo'lib qolmoqda.

Kalit so'zlar: Kirkpatrick modeli, o'quv dasturi, baholash, trening samaradorligi, xulq-atvor, natijalar.





АННОТАЦИЯ

Данная статья рассматривает модель оценки Киркпатрика как комплексный подход, применяемый для оценки учебных программ и тренингов. Описаны четыре уровня модели — Реакция, Обучение, Поведение и Результаты — и их роль в определении эффективности обучения. Автор подчеркивает важность оценки не только первоначальных впечатлений участников, но и изменений в их профессиональном поведении и влияния на организацию. Для каждого уровня приведены реальные примеры, включая курс по обучению преподавателей использованию технологий. Несмотря на критику за простоту, модель остается полезным инструментом для повышения эффективности как в образовании, так и в рабочих процессах.

Ключевые слова: Модель Киркпатрика, учебная программа, оценка, эффективность тренинга, поведение, результаты.

Introduction

Evaluation is a systematic process used to determine the value, quality, or effectiveness of a program, project, individual performance, or system. It serves multiple purposes: improving processes, making informed decisions, ensuring accountability, and measuring outcomes. Over time, various models of evaluation have emerged, each grounded in different philosophical, pedagogical, or managerial assumptions.

This article investigates core evaluation models widely applied across disciplines, including education, training, public policy, and development projects. Understanding these models helps stakeholders select appropriate frameworks suited to their specific goals and contexts.

Literature Review

The literature on evaluation models is rich and diverse, reflecting different schools of thought and methodological orientations.

1. Tyler's Objective-Based Model (1949)
One of the earliest systematic evaluation models, proposed by Ralph Tyler, focuses on predefined objectives. Evaluation in this model is the process of determining the extent





to which educational goals have been achieved. It is linear, straightforward, and outcome-focused, widely used in educational settings.

2. CIPP Model (Context, Input, Process, Product) – Daniel Stufflebeam (1971)

Stufflebeam introduced a comprehensive model that assesses not only outcomes but also the broader planning and implementation process. It is decision-oriented and emphasizes continuous improvement, making it suitable for complex programs.

3. Kirkpatrick’s Four-Level Model (1959)

Kirkpatrick’s model is widely used in training and development. It assesses:

- Reaction (how participants feel),
- Learning (knowledge/skills acquired),
- Behavior (application on the job),
- Results (organizational impact).

4. Scriven’s Goal-Free Evaluation (1972)

Michael Scriven proposed evaluating a program without reference to its stated goals, focusing instead on actual outcomes. This approach helps uncover unintended consequences and offers an unbiased perspective.

5. Logic Models: Often used in program planning and evaluation, logic models illustrate the relationship between resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and long-term impacts. They offer a visual framework for aligning evaluation with strategic objectives.

Recent literature, such as that from the American Evaluation Association and works by authors like Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2011), emphasizes the need for culturally responsive and participatory evaluation practices in diverse settings.

Discussion

Evaluation models vary in their approach, focus, and application. The choice of model depends on factors such as the evaluation purpose, stakeholder needs, resources, and the complexity of the subject being evaluated.

Model	Focus	Strengths	Limitations
Tyler Model	Achievement of objectives	Clear, easy to implement	Ignores unintended outcomes
CIPP Model	Comprehensive program evaluation	Useful for formative and summative use	Complex, time-consuming





Model	Focus	Strengths	Limitations
Kirkpatrick Model	Training effectiveness	Practical for corporate learning	Hard to isolate results from other factors
Goal-Free Evaluation	Actual outcomes	Unbiased, identifies hidden effects	May lack focus or stakeholder alignment
Logic Models	Strategic alignment	Visual and systematic	Needs detailed planning

Each model can be adapted and integrated depending on evaluation needs. For example, a training program could combine Kirkpatrick’s model for immediate feedback and CIPP for overall program review.

Results

The comparative analysis suggests that no single evaluation model is universally superior. Instead, effectiveness depends on how well the chosen model aligns with the purpose and scope of the evaluation. Practitioners often blend models for more comprehensive insights.

Key takeaways include:

- Objective-based models work best when goals are clear and measurable.
- Development programs benefit from process-focused models like CIPP.
- Training programs thrive under the layered analysis of Kirkpatrick’s model.
- Goal-free evaluations help surface unexpected outcomes.
- Logic models are excellent tools for mapping and communicating program theory.

Conclusion

Evaluation is not a one-size-fits-all process. The selection of an appropriate model requires an understanding of the evaluation context, objectives, and stakeholders. As evaluation continues to evolve—especially in a global, interconnected world—there is increasing demand for inclusive, flexible, and responsive approaches.

By critically analyzing and appropriately applying various evaluation models, evaluators can generate more meaningful, actionable insights that contribute to learning, accountability, and improvement across sectors.





References

1. Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). *The Relevance of the CIPP Evaluation Model for Educational Accountability*.
3. Kirkpatrick, D. (1959). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. Berrett-Koehler.
4. Scriven, M. (1972). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*.
5. Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
6. American Evaluation Association (www.eval.org)
7. W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2004). *Logic Model Development Guide*.

A large, faint, light blue watermark logo is centered on the page. It features a central lightbulb with radiating lines, surrounded by a complex geometric pattern of interconnected lines and circles, resembling a stylized house or a network structure.

**Research Science and
Innovation House**

